

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/010,976	Applicant(s) Gregory et al.
	Examiner Brigitte R. Hammond	Art Unit 2833

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brigitte R. Hammond

(3) _____

(2) Laurence Letson

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 20, 2004

Type: a) Telephonic. b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed:

Good et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's attorney discussed the biasing of the spring of Good et al. being in the opposite direction of applicant's invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Brigitte R. Hammond
Examiner's signature, if required